



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,467	02/27/2004	James R. Stelzer	5887-307U1	8565
570	7590	02/13/2007	EXAMINER	
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P. ONE COMMERCE SQUARE 2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			NGUYEN, DAT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/13/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/789,467	STELZER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dat T. Nguyen	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-5,8,9,12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendments filed on January 23, 2006 in which applicant amends claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12, adds claims 14-21, cancels claims 1, 6-7, 10-11 and 13, and responds to claim rejections. Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12 and 14-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rakib (US 2002/0019984 A1).
3. Regarding claim 8, the rejection as stated in the previous office action dated 10/19/2005 is maintained and incorporated herein.
4. Rakib further teaches a PDA like remote device wherein the amusement device has a touch screen (paragraph 51) operable to storing a plurality of video games playable on the respective first and third amusement devices using at least the respective video touch screen (Rakib discloses that it is well known in the art that many communication systems commonly implemented provide services such as video on demand, broadband internet access, home security monitoring, and interactive games (paragraph 3) and Rakib further teaches that the PDA like remote is capable of

Art Unit: 3714

performing one or more of these functions as disclosed in paragraphs 10-17). Finally, the game of Rakib is taught as being disclosed in the headend unit as oppose to being in the remote device, however the examiner has interpreted this as being a matter of design choice and does not increase or alter the functionality of the system wherein the player is still able to play the game on the remote device. Furthermore the device of Rakib is disclosed as being a PDA device, which is well known in the art as being capable of storing and playing videogames.

5. Regarding claim 2 and 3, the previous office action discussed how Rakib teaches an amusement communication system that downloads, stores, and plays received music files (please refer to the previous office action dated 10/19/2005 for a detailed explanation). Rakib further teaches a system which can download, store, and play multimedia files (TIVO, further described on page 7 of Rakib).

6. Regarding claim 9, Rakib teaches the broadcast signal is in the range of one of RF, HI and microwave (paragraphs 51 and 77).

7. Regarding claim 20, wherein the communication link forms a wireless local area network (Fig. 4 and 5 and the description thereof).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4, 5, 12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rakib (US 2002/0019984 A1) in view of Knowles (US 5,481,509)
9. Regarding claims 12, and 21, the rejections and discussion of the Rakib reference as stated in the office action dated 10/19/2005 is incorporated herein.
10. Regarding the playable video game of claims 12 and 21, please see paragraph 4 above.
11. Further regarding claim 17, 19 and 21, Rakib is silent regarding the amusement device being coin operated, currency operated or credit/debit card operated. In a related patent, Knowles teaches a currency operated jukebox music system. One would be motivated to combine the currency operation method of Martin et al. with the amusement system and controller of Rakib in order to generate income for the owners of the system. Furthermore, Rakib teaches the remote device being capable of ordering video-on-demand programs, wherein the remote is performing the transaction of currency/credit for a service (paragraph 13 of Rakib). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a currency operated or credit/debit card operation feature similar to Knowles with the amusement system of Rakib in order to generate income and business for the owners of the amusement system.
12. Regarding claim 4 and 16, Rakib is further silent regarding the inclusion of a video touch screen in the second amusement device. Knowles however discloses a video touch screen in a related patent application disclosing a jukebox entertainment

system. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the second amusement device of Rakib with a video touch screen as taught by Knowles in order to provide more functionality and increased ease of use for users because it is well known in the art that video touch screens offer better functionality than conventional buttons.

13. Regarding claim 5, please see the discussion of claim 12 as stated in the previous office action wherein it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include more than one remote so that other users can access the amusement system from other rooms or locations.

14. Regarding claim 14, please refer to the discussion of claims 2 and 3 above.

15. Regarding claim 15, please refer to the discussion of claim 9 above.

16. Regarding claim 18, please refer to the discussion of claim 20 above.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-5, 8, 9, 12 and 14-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dat T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 5712722178. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John M. Hotaling can be reached on (571)272-4437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dat Nguyen



2/12/07

ROBERT OLSZEWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700